## lask Enter Year Agrael?

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Harry Morris et al. Art Unit: 2151

Serial No.: 09/690,007 Examiner: Backhean Tiv

Filed: October 17, 2000 Conf. No.: 1832

Title : DISPLAYING ADVERTISEMENTS IN A COMPUTER NETWORK

**ENVIRONMENT** 

## MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## REPLY TO ACTION OF MAY 31, 2006

In reply to the final Office action of May 31, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-28, 55-57, and 54-74 are pending, with claims 1, 15, and 55 being independent.

Claims 1-28, 55-57, and 64-74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,637) in view of Guyot (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,098) and Moraes (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,502). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because none of Blumenau, Guyot, Moraes or any proper combination of the references describe or suggest the features of the independent claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of presenting advertising to viewers in a computer network environment. The method includes, *inter alia*, determining an amount of time to be used in displaying advertisements on a viewer's associated computer system based on monitoring the viewer's interactions with the computer system, and, based on the determined amount of time, varying an amount of display time for which an advertisement is to be displayed on the viewer's associated computer system.

The Office action recognizes that "the combination of Blumenau and Guyot did not expressly [describe] varying an amount of display time (duration or length of advertisement display time)." See Office action of May 31, 2006 at page 4. Rather, the Office action relies on Moraes to describe this feature. However, Moraes does not describe or suggest varying an amount of time for which an advertisement is displayed. Instead of displaying an advertisement